

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 11, and 17 being the independent claims. Claim 1 is amended to clarify the invention. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Chen in view of Schuster

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0030950 to Chen et al. (herein "Chen") in view of United States Patent No. 6,954,454 to Schuster (herein "Schuster"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide the following arguments to support patentability as follows.

The Office Action dated April 4, 2008 (herein "Office Action") provides that "Chen does not explicitly teach if the packet is voice, the gateway further determines if the voice is destined for the analog telephone or a media terminal adapter, if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone, the gateway depacketizes the voice packet, generates a voice signal and transmits it [via the second telephone line] to the analog telephone, if the packet is destined for the media terminal adapter, the gateway reformats

the packet and transmits the packet to the media terminal adapter via the first telephone line." (*see*, Office Action, Pages 2 - 3). For the reasons to be discussed below, Schuster does not provide the aforementioned missing teaching or suggestion with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the Office Action fails to disclose a *prima facie* case of obviousness. (*See*, MPEP 2143A)

Schuster discloses an "architecture for a central office ('CO') using Internet Protocol ('IP') technology." (*see*, Schuster, col. 1, lines 7-8). FIG. 2 of Schuster illustrates a Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC) centric Internet Protocol central office (IPCO) 100 that "comprises a Main Distribution Frame ('MDF') 110, a CO switch 120, and an IP telephony system 130. (*see*, Schuster, col. 4, lines 51-52). The IP telephony system 130 further "comprises an IP router 140, an Internet Telephony Gateway ('ITG') 150, a modem Remote Access Server ('RAS') 160, a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer ('DSLAM') 170, and a Signaling Gateway ('SG') 180." (*see*, Schuster, col. 4, lines 53-57). The IP router 140 "is used for routing IP packets within the IP telephony system 130 based on the information in their IP headers." (*see*, Schuster, col. 7, lines 19-21). The IP router 140 "may be connected to **a number of different IP networks**, including an IP data network 141, an IP voice network 142, a cable network 143, an IP backhaul for a wireless network 144, and an enterprise network 145." (*emphasis added*, *see*, Schuster, col. 7, lines 31-35).

To illustrate the operation of the CLEC centric IPCO 100, Schuster discloses "a few examples of telephony call flow scenarios." (*see*, Schuster, col. 9, lines 53-55). According to Schuster,

- [a] first user on the cable network 143 places a voice call to a second user on the wireless network 144 using an analog phone plugged into a cable

set top box on the first user's premises. The set top box converts the analog voice call to RTP IP packets and forwards the RTP IP packets to the IP router 140. The IP router 140 then sends the RTP IP packets to the wireless network 144, *which either converts the IP RTP packets back into a voice call and transmits the voice call to the second user, or sends the IP RTP packets to the second user for conversion back into a voice signal.*

(*emphasis added, see, Schuster, col. 9, lines 54-64*).

Hence, it is either the *wireless network 144* or the *second user* that converts the IP RTP packets back into a voice call not the IPCO 100. Therefore, Schuster does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone, *the gateway depacketizes the voice packet, generates an analog voice signal, and transmits the analog voice signal via the second telephone line to the analog telephone*", as recited by claim 1. Thus, the combination of Chen and Schuster does not teach each and every feature of claim 1, and therefore does not meet the requirements for *prima facie* obviousness. (*See, MPEP 2143A*) Dependent claims 2 - 10 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Chen and Schuster for the same reasons as claim 1 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The combination of Chen and Schuster does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 11. For example, as discussed above in regards to claim 1, the combination of Chen and Schuster does not teach or suggest at least the features of "depacketizing the voice packet, generating an analog voice signal, and transmitting the analog voice signal over the first phone line by the gateway to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone" as recited by claim 11. Dependent claims 12-16 are

likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Chen and Schuster for the same reasons as claim 11 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The combination of Chen and Schuster does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 17. For example, as discussed above in regards to claim 1, the combination of Chen and Schuster does not teach or suggest at least the features of "means for depacketizing the voice packet, means for generating an analog voice signal, and means for transmitting the analog voice signal over the first phone line to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone" as recited by claim 17. Dependent claims 18-20 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Chen and Schuster for the same reasons as claim 17 from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 7/7/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
806671_1.DOC